



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Nomenclature recommends that we should teach along the lines advocated by Professor Hale. In the first place, the Committee, as the writer understands it, was appointed to recommend a uniform grammatical terminology, not to dictate the method of teaching; secondly, it has done away with a term, Sequence of Tenses, which was in universal use, to introduce a new one, Harmony of Tenses, for which, under its method of teaching the subject, there was little or no necessity. Why could it not have admitted two attitudes toward the interpretation of the tenses, and have recommended the term which is already in use, to represent the idea which must have a name, if we recognize, as most of us do, that there *is* a Sequence of Tenses? The same iconoclastic attitude of the Committee is evident on certain other topics: but it would be outside the province of this paper to discuss them. And yet the term Sequence of Tenses expresses a concept useful in connection with the grammar of each and every language studied in the Schools of this country. In Greek, to be sure, it is a Sequence of Moods; in the various Modern Languages, it is partly a Sequence of Tenses, but partly also a matter of choice of auxiliary verbs. We all of us feel the proper use of *may* and *might*, of *can* and *could*, and the like, as a matter of sequence, not as a matter of selection of the form with reference to its absolute value. So it is with the use of the subjunctive tenses in the modern Romance Languages, and so it is in German, though *Repraesentatio* is tending in both of them to replace the past subjunctive by the present. Still there runs through all these languages a common psychological principle, which finds formulation most naturally under the term Sequence: Sequence of Moods in Greek, of Tenses in Latin and the Modern Romance Languages, of Tenses, for the most part, in German, and of Auxiliaries, mainly, in English—though with the auxiliaries of German and English the tense distinction lies underneath. The term Harmony will hardly serve as a substitute; Harmony of Moods seems less fitting, surely, than Sequence of Moods, for Greek.

The writer therefore lodges a protest against the shelving of the principle of the Sequence of Tenses, and hopes that the threatened passing of the rule from our teaching will be vigorously opposed by all who have a courageous conviction that a dependent clause, if integrally dependent, really does depend upon that on which it is dependent and that dependent subjunctives in Latin do under all normal circumstances present actions in their temporal relations to the verbs on which they depend.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

REVIEWS

Elements of Latin. By Benjamin W. Mitchell. New York and Philadelphia: Hinds, Noble, and Eldredge (1912). Pp. 303. \$1.00.

A recent reviewer remarked that he who would present a new freshman rhetoric deserved to be hanged.

Without taking so Draconian a position, we doubtless all feel that a new beginners' Latin book should have distinctive excellences to justify its entry into a field already so well occupied. The distinctive feature claimed for this book by its author is its adaptation to the needs of the Schools which admit pupils semi-annually. It consists of "two fairly complete and independent portions", each of which is intended to furnish a semester's work. The first part, accordingly, consists of forty-six lessons devoted to "the forms of inflection and a few elementary principles of the simple sentence". The second part consists of a systematic presentation of syntax and a somewhat simplified version of Caesar's account of the Helvetian War.

Certain characteristics of the treatment result from this thorough-going separation of forms from syntax. If all the forms are to be introduced during the first semester, the introduction of forms must be more rapid than in most recent beginners' books; and in many cases the forms must be learned long before much use of them is made. We should note, however, that many constructions are introduced practically in the sentences of the first part, although the explanation is reserved for the second part. In Lesson VI, for example, the ablatives of instrument and of accompaniment are thus smuggled in. In the following lessons we find the similar introduction of the ablatives of separation, manner, specification, attendant circumstance, and agent. The ablative of comparison, however, does not appear in connection with the comparison of adjectives. In Lesson XL the dative of agent is merely translated in a note. All this seems to be a rather radical use of the inductive method in a book in most respects severely deductive.

Dr. Mitchell has given us what is frankly an introduction to Caesar's Commentaries. The author apparently has little sympathy with those who would make the first year of Latin work an introduction to varied aspects of ancient life, and still less with those who show the pupil that the Latin is a medium capable of expressing anything connected with the life of the present. All the exercises seem to be strictly Caesarean in subject-matter as well as in diction and idiom; they are, in fact, *disiecta membra Caesaris*, idiomatic fragments torn from their context, involving along with the particular point to be illustrated whatever else Caesar happened to introduce. Such sentences, if we may judge from early experiences with Professor White's original Greek Lessons, may well be more difficult than the continuous text. The reading lessons are also exclusively Caesarean with but a moderate amount of simplification and annotation.

Pedagogically this book is conservative. The method is predominantly deductive. Illustrative sentences are relatively few. Masses of related forms or principles are introduced without much regard to what can be immediately used and assimilated. In Lesson XXIX, for example, we find introduced for the first time nearly the entire active force of the first

conjugation: namely, the subjunctive, the imperative, the infinitives, the participles, the gerund and the supine. The next lesson gives *sum* entire, and the next the entire passive of *amo*.

We find in Dr. Mitchell's book grammatical as well as pedagogical conservatism. There seems to be little thought of preparing the way for the comparative or historical study of the language. Not even the three historically and essentially distinct forces of the ablative are recognized. The subjunctive is presented as "essentially a subordinate mood". We hear of the "supine stem" and the "substantive clause of purpose". The term "volitive" is employed, but it is coupled with "optative" as "expressing wish". On the other hand the author recognizes the recent and useful category of the "ablative of attendant circumstance", and states clearly the essential distinction between the circumstantial and the purely temporal *cum*-clause.

I notice, finally, certain pedagogical felicities and infelicities. The hand of the apt and experienced teacher is frequently present. Fresh, luminous and helpful explanations are given at many points where the pupil is likely to go astray; examples are the treatment of the various types of third declension stems, the various classes of pronouns, "it" as a subject, the subjective and the objective genitive, the ablative absolute, the gerundive, conditions, and indirect discourse. The appendix contains convenient summaries and tables of grammatical facts. The pictorial illustrations include reproductions of several of Professor Swain's photographs of scenes connected with the Helvetian war, besides numerous representations of ancient objects. These latter illustrations are not limited to Caesarean and military subjects, but form the one feature of the book connecting it with the broader life of antiquity. Now and then one meets details the felicity of which is not so obvious. We are told, for example, that the long and short vowels differ "only in duration of time", but *entail* and *redeem* are given as illustrating the long and the short sounds of *e* and *i* respectively—this, however, is a common inconsistency in Latin text-books. In the definition of the finite forms of the verb as "those which are limited by requirements of time, person, and number", is not the inclusion of "time" misleading? It is an innovation to extend the term "appositives" to include predicate nouns. Is it helpful? From § 412 one would get the impression that the substantive *quod*-clause is exclusively appositional in use, this feature being emphasized by the unfamiliar term "Appositive Clauses of Explanation". In the vocabulary of Lesson XXXI, *ab* lacks the fundamental meaning *from*. Upon the introduction of the imperfect tense in Lesson XI the author admirably states the force of that tense, but the perfect is not introduced until Lesson XXVIII. In the meantime the pupil—from certain sentences we almost suspect that this is true of the author as well—is tempted to forget that the imperfect does not properly function as an aorist. Unfortunately this feature seems to be shared by nearly all beginners' books.

The book as a whole impresses one as the careful work of a conservative and at the same time independent classical teacher. It provides in two relatively independent parts an introduction to Caesar, which, while somewhat Spartan in its demands on the pupil, ought to be effective—for the survivors.

DELAND, FLA.

W. S. GORDIS.

The Composition of the Iliad. An Essay on a Numerical Law in its Structure. By Austin Smyth. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. (1914). Pp. 233. \$1.75.

This book seeks to bring a new proof for the hypothesis that the Iliad is the work of but one individual, in the sense in which we might use a similar phrase about the poem of a modern author. The necessity of the hypothesis is the corollary drawn (pages 188 ff.) from the main thesis "that the Iliad of Homer at one time consisted of 13,500 lines, neither more nor less, divided into 45 sections of 300 verses each, with major divisions after the 15th and 30th of these", the remaining 2193 verses being more recent additions which ought to be removed.

At the outset I find myself in agreement with the author upon one important point; if such a law exists it should be possible to find some reason for its existence. Such a reason Mr. Smyth finds in the law being an artificial aid to the memory of man at a time when the use of writing was but little known. I, however, cannot see that the law could be of real service for that purpose, but consider myself exempt from further discussion of the question, because I regard it as proved that no poem of 13,500 lines could be composed without the aid of writing (for the evidence, cf. Meier, *Werden und Leben des Volksepos*, p. 27 and note 102). The law, therefore, if it is to be accepted at all, must stand as something for which the *raison d'être* is as yet unknown.

In spite of this uncertainty, the law deserves to be discussed on its own merits. The first point to be made is that Mr. Smyth's solution must stand or fall with the Oxford text. In discussing Iliad 14. 269 he writes (85 f.) as follows:

And here the reader will with justice wish to know whether there are not in our previous cantos some more of these isolated verses, which rest upon little manuscript authority, and which when thrown out would reduce our number below the 300. I will answer in this way. Hitherto our rejection of this species of verse has included, with one exception <5.808>, all those that are bracketed in the Oxford text of the late Provost of Oriel, a man of the most steady judgment, and of course in the front rank of Homeric scholars; so that if there are any other verses which can fairly be impugned on the ground of insufficient manuscript authority (but I do not believe that there are), it can always be replied that it was not so clear to this excellent critic that they ought to be excised.

Without criticising such an attitude in general, it is sufficient to say that this reply allows neither for an increase of manuscript evidence, nor for a possible